

REMARKS

Summary Of Office Action

Claims 1-16 were pending in this application.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Raza et al. U.S. Patent 6,510,487.

Claims 2-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kean et al. U.S. Patent 5,737,235 (hereinafter "Kean").

Claims 4-8 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 9-16 are allowed.

Summary Of Applicants' Reply

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 9-16 are allowed and that claims 4-8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants cancelled claims 1, 5, and 6, amended claim 2, and added claims 17-21.

Applicants' Reply

I. Claim 1

Applicants cancelled claim 1. The rejection to claim 1 is therefore moot.

II. Claims 2-8

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 3 as being anticipated by Kean.

Claims 4-8 were objected to for being dependent from a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants cancelled dependent claims 5 and 6, and amended independent claim 2. Claim 2 is the base claim from which claim 5 depends. Claim 2 was amended to include the features of claim 5. Therefore, claim 2, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 7, and 8, which depend from claim 2, are therefore also in condition for allowance.

III. Claims 9-16

The Examiner indicated that claims 9-16 are in condition for allowance.

IV. New Claims 17-21

As indicated above, applicants cancelled dependent claim 6. The base claim from which claim 6 depends is claim 2 (prior to amendment).

Applicants added new claims 17-21. New independent claim 17 is independent claim 2 (prior to amendment) including the features of cancelled dependent claim 6. Therefore, claim 17, which is claim 6 written in independent form to include all the features of the base claim from which it depends (claim 2; prior to amendment), is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, claims 18-21, which depend from claim 17, are therefore also in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The foregoing demonstrates that claims 2-4 and 7-21 are in condition for allowance. This application is therefore

Application No. 10/643,276
Reply to June 1, 2004 Office Action
Amendment dated August 31, 2004

in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and
allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jared Kneitel
Registration No. 51,178
Agent for Applicants
FISH & NEAVE
Customer No. 36981
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020
Tel.: (212) 596-9000